

**Newsletter**

Number: 6

Date: September, 1974

**Pilot Projects**

The Metropolitan Separate School Board has recently approved a proposal that will involve the combined participation of members of this board and members of the E.R.A.S. Task Force and the Ministry's Supervisory Services Branch, which operates the program for Co-operative Evaluation of School Systems. The general focus of the project will be the examination and assessment of the administrative structure of the school system with a view to retaining the present structure or making specific recommendations for change. Mr. John Flynn, Assistant Superintendent with the Metropolitan Separate School Board, has been appointed to serve as project co-ordinator.

The Simcoe Roman Catholic Separate School Board, which had been attempting to implement certain resource allocation concepts in the area of plant operations, has discontinued its participation as an E.R.A.S. pilot project. The project was terminated due to a change in the board's staffing pattern and a desire on the part of the board to place more emphasis on curriculum matters at this time.

**Progress Report:  
Grey County Board  
of Education  
(pilot project)**

The language arts and mathematics programs of the Junior Division are the areas under consideration in this project, which involves a family of schools in the Owen Sound region. Working committees comprised of teachers from the schools involved in the project have been attempting to develop curricula consistent with the aims and goals adopted by the board. The accomplishments of these two committees will serve in the future as the foundation for a county-wide program in language arts and mathematics.

Members of the mathematics working committee have outlined the scope and sequence of their curriculum and have developed a resource package which offers useful teaching strategies and materials. The language arts working committee has developed a program structure by dividing the program into four major skill areas and formulating objectives for each of these areas. Both committees are presently considering evaluation procedures that will allow them to assess the effectiveness of the programs developed and that will act as a basis for making improvements in the programs.

**Nipissing Board of  
Education  
(pilot project)**

The project's planning committee initially considered the following topics as possible areas for the application of resource allocation concepts: business administration, the teaching of French as a second language, and in-school administration. In selecting a topic, two considerations were emphasized: the involvement of as many people as possible; and the development of a logical decision-making process rather than the solution of a specific current problem.

The planning committee decided that the area of in-school administration best satisfied these two requirements. Principals, vice-principals, department heads and secretaries were identified by the committee as the personnel involved in in-school administration. Principals were asked to submit lists indicating what they felt their responsibilities were. From these lists, objectives for the in-school administration program were to be developed.

When the complexities of this task became apparent, it was decided to limit the scope of the project. Therefore, the committee decided to concentrate its efforts on in-school administration in the areas of curriculum and business matters. Three principals and one vice-principal were invited to discuss with the planning committee activities underway within their particular schools that reflected their responsibilities in curriculum or business matters. The planning committee divided itself into four teams, each to work with an in-school administrator towards developing a model for decision-making. It is intended that these models should assist in:

- delineating in-school administration responsibilities for curriculum and/or business matters;
- relating these responsibilities to goal statements;
- developing objectives that, if accomplished, will achieve or at least contribute towards the carrying out of the responsibility;
- indicating the time(s) at which the objectives could be expected to be achieved and the criteria for their assessment.

As these models are developed, implemented, and evaluated, it is expected that a general framework for in-school administrative decision-making applicable to the entire system will result.



**Lincoln County Board  
of Education**  
(pilot project)

**Comments Regarding  
Evaluation**

Two secondary schools, Governor Simcoe (R. Hayes, Principal) and West Park (R. Baum, Principal), became pilot units in the development of a resource allocation system in Lincoln County. During the past twenty months, many E.R.A.S. activities have been undertaken in the two schools and in other parts of the system.

Considerable work has been done by the two staffs in determining school goals, department objectives, and course objectives. A survey of community attitudes has provided some input for this exercise. An "Objectives Committee" has assisted many schools in discussions and subsequent definition of educational intents. Another committee has prepared an account code for re-aligning current budgeting and accounting information into a program format. A third committee keeps up to date on trends and activities of a P.P.B.E.S. nature in Canada and the United States in order to avoid repeating in Lincoln mistakes made elsewhere.

The development and installation of E.R.A.S. in Lincoln County has become a major undertaking by the staff and board.

Evaluation is one of the most difficult areas in resource allocation as it is in education as a whole. The E.R.A.S. Working Paper No. 3 deals primarily with evaluation as it relates to student learning objectives, although it touches upon the matter of evaluation as it might be employed with respect to planning and programming activities. The comments noted below, provide several perspectives on the matter of evaluation.

*OSSTF, Curriculum Design '72, pp. 42-5.*

Formative evaluation is most useful to the classroom teacher for the following reasons:

- It is an on-going evaluation in which the learner should discover for himself what has been mastered and what still has to be learned.
- It helps to decide prerequisite skills.
- It helps to focus on short range objectives.
- It is useful in evaluating teaching and learning strategies which then leads to evaluation of curriculum.

Summative evaluation is used at the end of a unit or course. Its primary purpose is to assign grades. Such evaluations are useful for assessing skills and abilities improved or gained through the work completed. This type of evaluation also facilitates comparison of the relative success of different approaches used in teaching the course.

... to evaluate student progress, we should examine our original objectives for that course or unit. In these we should have stated what we would like the student to be able to do on completion of the course or unit. By examining the "doing" aspect of the objective, we should ask ourselves what we are going to ask the student to do to demonstrate to us that he has attained those same objectives.

*Ministry of Education, Ontario, Secondary School Diploma Requirements, H.S. 1 1974-75, pp. 3-4.*

Procedures for evaluating student progress should be varied enough to meet the requirements of different individuals and groups of students, different courses, and different learning environments. Formative and summative appraisal, standardized testing, subjective and objective assessment, examination of cognitive, affective, and psychomotor development—all these methods of evaluation should be considered for both the advantages and disadvantages each may have in any learning situation. The most effective evaluation relies on abundant information gathered by observation and assessment, to which the professional judgment of the teacher is applied as the significant factor in determining student progress and achievement.

*R. S. Fleming, Curriculum for Today's Boys and Girls, 1963, p. 495.*

The process of evaluation is the same whether it serves an entire school faculty or the individual teacher. The faculty may use this process in planning ways of improving the program; the individual teacher may use it as she studies a group of children and plans ways of helping them.

Evaluation may be thought of as providing a basis for curriculum planning. It is more than testing; it is more than measurement. There are those who tend to place evaluation in a terminal position rather than to conceive of it as a vital part of the entire educational activity. It is proposed that evaluation might well become the central ingredient around which the work of curriculum planning emerges.